REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application. All of these claims were rejected in the present Office Action. By this amendment, claims 2-4, 9, 16, and 28 have been amended and new claims 30-32 have been added. The claim amendments and additions do not add new matter. Support for claims 30-32 may be found, for example, in at least pages 5-27 and FIGs. 4-10 of the present specification. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections based on the following remarks.

Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,331). The Applicants note that although the present Office Action indicated all of claims 1-29 were rejected as being anticipated by Alexander, the remarks in the anticipation rejection did not specifically address claims 8, 19, and 20. Notwithstanding, these claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) later in the Office Action. Accordingly, the Applicants assume that the indication of claims 8, 19, and 20 being rejected under §102(e) was a typographical error and, instead, the intent of the rejection was to reject claims 1-7, 9-18, and 21-29 under §102(e). Nonetheless, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-29 under §102(e) for the following reasons:

Regarding independent claim 1, the Office Action has asserted that Alexander discloses all of the elements of the claimed method. These cited sections of Alexander, however, do not teach the claimed features as alleged. For example, Alexander teaches a system and process for managing content of web pages organized in a tag-delimited template using data that describes data, also known as "metadata." The template is used, for example, to design a series of related web pages where the data types and web page structure are described and stored in the template. In particular, Alexander teaches an example of building a form allowing entry of metadata into a

metadata template 100 defining a data entry form with particular fields (See FIG. 6) that is, in turn, used to organize and develop a Web page. The system of Alexander merely affords a user the ability to enter metadata into already defined class or property fields for Web page design, but does teach accessing a discrete data component from a data source, associating the accessed discrete data component with at least one domain and then adding further domain specific contextual information to that data component to achieve enhanced data as featured in claim 1.

In particular, Alexander does not teach accessing a discrete component of data from at least one data source since, the cited section of Alexander purported as teaching this element (i.e., col. 2, ll. 57-59) recites "the present invention is a system and process for managing content organized in a tag-delimited template using metadata." This section of Alexander does not teach "accessing at least one discrete component of data from at least one data source," but instead merely teaches that a metadata template is provided by the system of Alexander. Applicants are unable to find mention of accessing as claimed. If the rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request a showing by column and line of such a teaching.

Moreover, Alexander does not teach "associating said at least one discrete component of data with at least one domain," and "adding domain specific contextual information to said at least one discrete component of data to provide enhanced data." The cited section of Alexander allegedly teaching these claimed elements (i.e., col. 2, ll. 65-67) merely teach that the data entry elements (metadata) in a template each include a set of information attributes describing the data entry element. The entered data elements are not added to the content, which has been correlated to the claimed "discrete component of data", but is actually entered into the template. Thus, Alexander fails to teach these claimed elements.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the elements of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Alexander. With respect to claims 2-7, which ultimately depend from claim 1, these claims are also allowable on their merits and for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. In particular, Alexander does not teach or suggest the provision of enhanced data by adding contextual information to discrete data that has been accessed from a source. Thus, the assigning access rights to enhanced data in claim 2, assigning usage rules to enhanced data in claim 3, and encoding enhanced data with a markup language in claim 4 would not be taught by Alexander.

Moreover, the receiving of feedback data from a user and modifying enhanced data to include the feedback data as featured in claim 7 is also not taught by Alexander. The examples from Alexander given in the present Office Action as teaching these elements are actually not feedback data, but merely form updates based on a HTTP post.

With respect to independent claim 9, this claim features the element of "receiving a request through at least one digital identity for enhanced data from a request, the enhanced data including added contextual information." As argued above with respect to claim 1, Alexander does not teach or suggest the addition of contextual information to achieve enhanced data. Accordingly, this claim is believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons as presented above with respect to claim 1.

With respect to dependent claims 10-15, these claims are believed to be allowable on their merits and for the reasons presented with respect to independent claim 9. Concerning claims 11 and 13, in particular, Alexander fails to teach operation of any part of the system from any entity outside of the server 11. The mere servicing by the server 11 of requests made to the

server from another entity are carried out by operation of the server 11. Thus, the assertion in the Office Action that this constitutes operation by another entity is untenable.

Independent claim 16 features a method for obtaining information about services that may be of interest to a user, including numerous steps, none of which are taught by Alexander. Alexander, as mentioned above, is drawn to a method and system for managing content in a template for web page design, which is not applicable to a method for obtaining information about services that may be of interest to a user.

Concerning specific elements in claim 16, this claim features "receiving content from ...[an] entity that includes terms of said at least one service," "filtering the content to determine whether the content satisfies at least one predetermined rule," and "generating at least one decision parameter based on profile and preference information." In rejecting these elements, the Office Action asserts teachings from Alexander relating to the authorization module 22 shown in FIG. 1 and authorization procedures. In particular, the teachings referenced (i.e., col. 4, ll. 57-63) disclose controlling the access permissions to data managed by the content management framework. This teaching, however, does not appear to specifically teach these elements.

For example the authorization module 22 taught by Alexander merely controls access permissions to data in a content management framework 18. The "content" of Alexander is merely access authorization information, not content including terms of service, for example. Moreover, the authorization process of Alexander does not appear to teach or suggest filtering of content received from an entity, but instead filters what data can be sent out to a user based on authorization level. Finally, Alexander does not teach or suggest generation of decision parameters based on profile and preference information. Rather, the referenced teaching is

merely deciding an access based on the received access information. Accordingly, Alexander does not appear to teach or suggest the claimed elements of claim 16 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Moreover, with respect to dependent claims 17-20, these claims are believed to be allowable on their merits and for the reasons presented with respect to independent claim 16.

With respect to claim 21, the Office Action asserts that Alexander discloses the claimed elements. The Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Alexander does not disclose all of the elements. In particular, claim 21 features "at least one discrete component of data," first contextual information that enhances . . .[the] discrete component of data for a first domain," "second contextual information that enhances . . .[the] discrete component for a second domain," and "the first domain [being] different from the second domain." Alexander, in contrast, does not appear to teach or suggest first and second contextual information enhancing data, nor enhancing the same discrete component of data. Rather, the sections of Alexander referenced only teach separate data entries each with an accompanying set of information attributes describing the data entry element, absent any other data such as contextual information to enhance the data entries. Moreover, Alexander teaches that each data entry has its own accompanying set of information attributes, but not that a single data entry includes first and second contextual information of first and second domains, respectively. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the cited reference does not appear to teach or suggest claim 21 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims 22-26, these claims are believed to be allowable on their merits and for the reasons presented with respect to independent claim 16.

Claims 27, 28 and 29 contain elements that correspond to elements in claims 1, 9, and 21, respectively. Accordingly these claims are believed allowable at least for the same reasons presented above and also on their own merits.

Claims 8, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Alexander, in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,824). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented previously with respect to claims 1 and 16, upon which claims 8 and 19-20 respectively depend, and also on their merits.

Concerning newly added claims 30-32, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest, among other things, the featured accessing data associated with a first entity by a second entity, associating a domain to the data by the second entity; and adding contextual information to the data by the second entity. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing comments, the Applicants submit that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application.

Applicants respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By:_____

Patrick B. Law

Date: November 1, 2004

Registration No. 41,549

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &
KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005